

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| PIN | 4276 | COUNTY | Santa Barbara |
| APPLICANT | Santa Barbara County | AMOUNT REQUESTED | \$132,050 |
| PROJECT TITLE | Santa Barbara County IRWMP Project | TOTAL PROJECT COST | \$174,950 |

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Santa Barbara County IRWMP Project will integrate, and as necessary, update existing planning documents for the County and other local agencies to meet the requirements of the IRWM Grant Program Guidelines and to better coordinate and integrate water supply and water quality projects. A regional stakeholders group comprised of the county, cities, water districts, community services districts and sanitary districts has been working together since October of 2002 to prioritize water related projects listed in local planning documents into one overarching priority list for the region. The list has been updated regularly and will serve as the basis for our implementation funding request. However, the prioritization process needs to be documented and the planning documents supporting the construction of these projects must be merged into one IRWMP. This project will complete both of those tasks and allow further development required information for the IRWMP.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 6

Comment: The work plan needs detail. The application includes a schedule and a budget. The work plan, budget, and schedule are generally consistent, but are difficult to compare and assess. The hours and costs for the first six items in preplanning and ongoing public outreach appear to be underestimated, particularly for such a complex undertaking. No deliverables are provided with each task for review.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The region is the County of Santa Barbara. The basis for the boundaries and benefits of defining the region was discussed. The applicant provided various maps showing basins, districts, municipalities, and discussed water supplies. The applicant discusses groundwater basin boundaries, watershed boundaries, ASBSs, quality and quantity of water resources within the region, discussion of reclaimed water, desalinated water, etc. issues. Water supply and demand through 2040 were also provided. Agencies involved in planning were listed. There is a logical discussion regarding current water supplies, but the focus strays away from the objectives of this proposal.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: A list of statewide priorities to be addressed in the IRWMP was provided; however, there were no specifics as to how these priorities will be incorporated and no good connections are demonstrated. The regional objectives are summarized, but were not elaborated upon. The applicant did not fully address major water related objectives and conflicts within the region.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: Although the applicant provided a list of water management strategies that it will consider, it is only a listing of the minimum IRWMP standards contained in the PSP and the Guidelines. There is not enough detail to determine how the strategies would be considered in the IRWMP. The applicant apparently failed to evaluate projects for integration. It appears that the list of projects is simply a list of existing projects and no synergistic effects are implied or demonstrated.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: A schedule for implementation and a project list is provided, but the schedule appears unrealistic. For example, the applicant indicates that it would only take one week to complete necessary planning, design, and permitting of projects on the IRWMP list. In addition, monitoring the performance of the IRWMP and project implementation was not discussed. The implementation procedures described were vague and not detailed, so it is difficult to get a sense of what they are proposing to do in this proposal. Actions to be taken for IRWMP development are discussed, but they are generalized and with no distinct direction or focus. There was no mechanism or process in the proposal that discussed how the applicant would monitor the performance of the IRWMP and implementation and changes to the IRWMP.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: The impacts and benefits are discussed only superficially. The discussion of the analysis of benefits within the region and adjacent areas is vague. It is unclear what specifically could be done to reduce reliance on imported water and what actions could be used to define "regional integrated water resources management." CEQA is only mentioned briefly; the applicant states that compliance would be done for specific projects. Efforts to address environmental concerns are discussed, but not fully.

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The applicant discusses studies that have been done in the area, but does not specifically identify any of the documents. There was no discussion of technical methods or analyses used to develop the IRWMP, measures that will be used to evaluate IRWMP performance, or monitoring systems that will be used to gather performance data. The applicant indicates that several technical evaluations have been completed, but they were not provided for review. The applicant briefly discusses existing data, but does not appear to have comprehensively evaluated it.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The proposal does not adequately demonstrate how the data will be effectively managed. The applicant mentions the County GIS database, but they did not mention any statewide data needs. There is a process in place to disseminate data to stakeholders, agencies, and the public. Statewide priorities are not fully discussed. This applicant only listed bulleted points for this item as provided in the PSP and Guidelines without expanding on the topic.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: Outreach activities to stakeholders are already in place and well developed. Stakeholder involvement is mentioned throughout the background document. Discussion was provided as to how the IRWMP development will incorporate stakeholder involvement. The applicant did not identify possible obstacles to IRWMP implementation, only stated that "additional efforts will be made during the plan development process to identify and plan for potential obstacles." The listed stakeholders group appears to be thorough, but has operated inconsistently. The stakeholder group apparently convened back in 2002 to get started, then disbanded in 2003, and reconvened in November 2004.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The applicant is not applying for a waiver or reduction of the Funding Match. A brief discussion was provided on the three DACs that are located in the region; however, the applicant did not document the water supply and water quality needs of the DACs. Representatives from the DACs would be included in the planning process. Implementation of the IRWMP would directly benefit DACs and two DACs have proposals on the project list.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The application included a long list of local planning documents that will be considered during development of the IRWMP; however, no link was made as to how the documents listed are or would be related to the IRWMP. Studies and plans are cited, but no connection was made between those documents and the IRWMP.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant is relying on local, State, and federal agencies to participate in the planning process because of their history and experience with the agencies in the past. The application does not specifically say how the IRWMP will facilitate coordination with local land-use planning decision makers and State and federal regulatory agencies. It only talks about participation in past projects.

TOTAL SCORE: 42